



**South Mountain Corridor Study
Citizens Advisory Team
Meeting Summary**

Date: September 25, 2008
Time: 6 p.m.
Location: South Mountain Community College

SMCAT Members Attending:

Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce, Carola Tamarkin
Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee, Laurel Arndt
Arlington HOA, Camilo Acosta
Arizona Public Health Association, Al Brown
Calabrea HOA, Brian Smith
City of Avondale, Carnell Thurman
Estrella Village Planning Committee, Peggy Eastburn
Foothills Club West HOA, Michael Hinz
Foothills Reserve HOA, Jim Wesley
Kyrene Elementary School District, Terry Tatterfield
Lakewood HOA, Chris Boettcher
Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development, Laurie Prendergast
Laveen Village Planning Committee, Wes Lines
Maricopa County Farm Bureau, Clayton Danzeisen
Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, Michael Goodman
Sierra Club, Sandy Bahr
South Mountain Village Planning Committee, Tamala Daniels
Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Woody Thomas
The Foothills HOA, Gary Reny

SMCAT Members Absent:

Arizona Trucking Association, Dave Williams
Bougainvillea HOA, Timmothy Stone
City of Tolleson
East Valley Partnership, Jack Sellers
Gila River Indian Community–District 4
Mountain Park Ranch HOA, Diane Krecker
Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association, Nathaniel Percharo
Silverado Ranch
South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce, Lisa Bray
Valley Forward, Steve Barclay

Staff and Consultants

Michael Bruder, ADOT
 Mark Hollowell, ADOT
 Larry Langer, ADOT
 Timothy Tait, ADOT
 Nan Wilcox, ADOT
 Bill Vachon, FHWA
 Michael Book, HDR
 Amy Edwards, HDR

Pat Higgins, HDR
 Heather Honsberger, HDR
 Ben Spargo, HDR
 Fred Erickson, KCA
 Tom Keller, KCA
 C. Murphy Hebert, PDG
 Dean Howard, PDG
 Andy Jacobs, PDG

Citizens:

Bill Coates
 William Diekmann
 Kerry Fehr-Snyder
 Steve Johnson
 Tim Lank
 Pat Lawlis
 Doug Murphy
 William Ramsay

Sergio Sanchez
 Robbie Sherwood
 Connie Scurris
 Arthur Suler
 Geri Thompson
 Linda Varragel
 Irene Wesley

Meeting Agenda	Speaker
Welcome and introductions	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT role and responsibilities	Tom Keller, KCA
Upcoming SMCAT meeting topics	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT questions and comments	All
SMCAT membership discussion	All
Pre-Draft Environmental Impact Statement SMCAT position statement discussion	All
Social conditions	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Pat Higgins, HDR
Estimated costs	Mike Bruder, ADOT Ben Spargo, HDR
Cumulative and secondary impacts	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Jack Allen, Jacobs
Visitor comment session	Tom Keller, KCA Public

Meeting began at 6:06 p.m.

Tom Keller: Good evening everyone. Can we begin please?

Welcome to the September 25 Citizens Advisory Team meeting for the proposed South Mountain Freeway. At the moment, we are one member short of a quorum. Should another member arrive, I will announce that we have a quorum. Funny, we had the highest number of member confirmations and we are still one person short of a quorum.

For the information of those members of the public that are attending for the first time, seated at the table are the SMCAT members. Seated near the wall are members of the ADOT study team. As we progress through tonight's agenda, should you have any questions, please write them down on one of the blue question cards that we have located in the back of the room. At the end of the meeting, your questions will be addressed. You can either pass in the card and I will read your question or you can read the question yourself. If by some chance there is a great amount of questions submitted and we are unable to address them all at this meeting, then the answer will be provided as part of the parking lot issues memorandum. The parking lot issues memorandum is made available on the ADOT Web site.

It looks like another SMCAT member just arrived. We now have a quorum.

It is important to note that the SMCAT is a body that will make a recommendation and not a decision. The recommendation will be one of two choices—building or not building this proposed freeway. The SMCAT is governed by an operating agreement, which was developed in April 2007. The operating agreement addresses a number of issues. One thing to remember is that all SMCAT members, and members of the public, treat each other with respect. Please make sure that if you are asking a question to someone, give them time to answer that question.

There is already an adjustment to tonight's agenda. The presenter of the cumulative and secondary impacts section had a family emergency, so he is unable to attend tonight's meeting. In your packets, the PowerPoint presentation slide number nine shows the October 23 meeting topics. Cumulative and secondary impacts will be added to the agenda for that meeting.

Before we begin the presentation for social conditions, there is one last item for discussion. We will probably complete most of the topics short of the release of the Draft EIS. Because of this, there will be some amount of time between the October 23 meeting and the first air quality panel meeting. What happens between now and then reminds me about when Fred and I became a part of this process in April 2007. At that point, there had been a period of time where the SMCAT members had not been meeting. It seemed that there was quite a bit of information that had to be revisited and, from a facilitation standpoint, it was a difficult process. Is there a way for this body to put a bookmark in time? If we were to reconvene in February or March 2008 or sometime further down the road, will your organization be able to keep up to speed? I say this because there is the chance that when we reconvene, there could be changes and you may not be the member representing your organization. I just want to ensure that the process can keep its continuity and have no transition issues.

What are your thoughts?

SMCAT Member: I am not sure what you mean when you say we should put a bookmark in time.

Tom Keller: I am asking that the information you have received at these meetings doesn't end with you and that there are other people in your organization who are up to speed.

SMCAT Member: Is this something in which you want us to vote?

Tom Keller: No. I just want to make sure that everyone is at a point where they could hand it off to another representative of their organization with few transition issues, if necessary.

SMCAT Member: We have gone through this before. If a SMCAT member is going to jump off then their organization should lose their role in the recommendation-making process. I don't think we should ask someone to come in new with only a few topics left to cover. I would hate to lose someone over the holiday break so I would just have to appeal to the members who are here now that they should just stick with this process to the end.

Tom Keller: That's a great sentiment, but you can't always control what is going on in other people's lives.

SMCAT Member: In my case, there was someone else who was representing my organization and some difficulties arose, which is why I am now the representative.

Tom Keller: Are there any other thoughts?

SMCAT Member: There are meeting minutes that exist from all of the past SMCAT meetings. I think the organizations could have someone review these notes to see where we are.

SMCAT Member: I think if we are going to make this recommendation then we should all just stick with it. It seems at every meeting I have attended, we spend too much time backtracking over past topics. Now, seven years after we began this membership, we are discussing this issue again. We can't keep going back to past topics. I am very tired of readdressing past issues. Once we have discussed a topic, it should be over and done.

Tom Keller: I am hearing a similar theme from your comments. There will be no need for a bookmark in time. Is that the feeling?

SMCAT Member: I would prefer that we just jump in and discuss air quality right now.

SMCAT Member: I think it is important that the person representing the organization that is making a recommendation on this freeway has been a part of the process and is not coming in at the last moment. Any new people coming on would not have the full understanding of the study.

Tom Keller: During the break between meetings, I anticipate that you will still have regular communication from the ADOT study team. Tim, is that correct?

Timothy Tait: Yes, the SMCAT will hear from us on a monthly basis.

SMCAT Member: If there is a SMCAT member who wants to remove his or herself from the process, we should require that the organization state their position on this proposed freeway before the change.

SMCAT Member: If the SMCAT membership changes, the affects would be different depending on the length of the break between meetings. If the break is short, we may not lose too much headway. Also, there could always be special meetings scheduled to get members who are added late, up to date.

Tom Keller: Yes, that is a possibility. We are just trying to ensure that the SMCAT remembers all the information that has been presented, the way that we remember it. If there happens to be any new members who join who are replacing current representatives, we want to make sure that it is a seamless transition. In April 2007, the transition was not smooth.

SMCAT Member: When is the facilitator's contract complete?

Tom Keller: Our intent is to be a part of the process until it is completed.

SMCAT Member: Well, does your contract end on a certain date? If you are not a continual part of these proceedings then that would also be something which would slow this process.

Tom Keller: Our contract is month-to-month. If our contract should happen to expire, there is a process in place so that these meetings could continue.

SMCAT Member: I would like to advocate that you be involved until this process is complete.

SMCAT Member: I understand the break around the holidays, but we may need to continue to meet to discuss special issues that may arise prior to the Draft EIS being released. We could consider meeting every other month to discuss these issues.

SMCAT Member: Yes, if we have enough special issues that would require a discussion, I think these meetings should continue.

Tom Keller: Regarding SMCAT membership, should you realize that you cannot continue representing your organization, let them and us know as soon as possible so we can work on getting a replacement as soon as possible.

SMCAT Member: I would like to add that it seems that we have the framework in place so should we have a new SMCAT member, we should be fine.

Tom Keller: Yes, that is certainly our intent. Can we move on?

No response

Tom Keller: For tonight's meeting, Gary Reny is taking the place of Chad Blostone for The Foothills Homeowners Association. You may recall that you voted last meeting to begin including Michael Hinz with Foothills Club West Homeowners Association as a part of the SMCAT. He is in attendance tonight. Also, you remember that Chris Boettcher is the new member from the Lakewood Homeowners Association.

SMCAT Member: In the minute notes from the previous meeting, I think I found one minor mistake on page 17. Halfway down the page, there is a comment from Ben Spargo, which reads, "To the best of my knowledge, the E1 Alignment that is shown here is the same one that is on the original. Much of the acreage from the park that was saved was along First Avenue." I believe that the acreage that was saved was at 51st Avenue.

Tom Keller: Did you get that, Mike?

Affirmative response from Michael Book, who was recording the meeting notes

Tom Keller: Does anyone have any questions or comments from anything that they have seen in the press since our last meeting?

SMCAT Member: Can I ask a question about the responses that ADOT has given us regarding the parking lot issues?

Tom Keller: Yes.

SMCAT Member: I was really disappointed with the first three pages of the September 25th Parking Lot Issues memorandum. There are many questions that are inadequately answered. I was hoping that some of the responses would contain actual hard numbers. I don't see many numbers shown to support the response. It seems that ADOT either cannot or will not quantify these items. You gave us a dollar figure for the time associated with someone who would be sitting in freeway traffic. Why can't you

give us numbers related to other study issues? In general, I feel the responses ADOT has provided are nebulous.

Tom Keller: Well, tonight's topics are social conditions and estimated costs. We are moving cumulative and secondary impacts to the October meeting. Will any of his questions be answered in tonight's presentation?

Mike Bruder: The answers to his questions wouldn't be addressed in tonight's topics.

Tom Keller: So can you give us a specific example of a question you do not feel was fully addressed?

SMCAT Member: Yes. One question reads, "What should be expected for the loss of home values and the associated loss of property taxes and tax revenues for the state, city and schools?" I would think that ADOT could provide dollar figures related to this. ADOT would just need to determine the number of homes that would be needed for this proposed freeway and then figure out what the property tax loss would be. The ADOT response provided to us reads, "The effects on loss of property tax are addressed in the economic section of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Because the number of homes being impacted is relatively negligible in the context of the total number of homes in the City of Phoenix, as well as the fact that many residents would likely relocate within the city, the effects on city revenues were deemed negligible when considering the W55 and E1 alternatives." I would say that my determination of what is considered negligible is different from what ADOT considers negligible. I want ADOT to provide hard numbers to this and the other questions in the Parking Lot Issue memorandum.

Tom Keller: Does anyone care to respond?

Amy Edwards: So you want to know the direct impact of ADOT purchasing property for this proposed freeway?

SMCAT Member: Yes. The question was basically skirted.

Amy Edwards: This information was reported in the technical report summary.

Ben Spargo: So you are just looking for more of a breakdown for the City of Phoenix impact?

SMCAT Member: I would like to see quantified amounts for the questions that have been asked. A topic from July was economic impacts. I thought that this would have included a presentation that would have given us information in dollar amounts.

I also don't think ADOT has been accounting for the value of the South Mountains.

SMCAT Member: In the July presentation, ADOT reported the estimated reduction of revenue based on future land use. I guess he is asking for harder numbers. Recently, an area school had a bond issue meeting. I wonder if they took into consideration that ADOT could be removing some homes from the area. I think for the topics that have associated hard numbers, ADOT should report those numbers.

Bill Vachon: We can take a look at that.

SMCAT Member: Here is another question that was asked in the Parking Lot Issues memorandum. “What about the loss of the community’s desirability due to the freeway ‘locking in’ the community?” The ADOT response was, “Ahwatukee is defined by geographic, political and transportation boundaries. The South Mountains, Gila River Indian Community, Pecos Road and Interstate 10 serve as those boundaries, respectively. In essence, the proposed action would replace Pecos Road.” This was the response to the effect that a 10-lane freeway replacing Pecos Road would have in Ahwatukee.

Tom Keller: ADOT has agreed to take a look at those questions and reevaluate the responses.

SMCAT Member: This proposed freeway will have a substantial impact to the community. ADOT has used the word, “negligible”. They need to provide some frame of reference for this word. ADOT’s definition of this term is much different than mine on my monthly budget.

Tom Keller: Are there any other issues?

SMCAT Member: There is a statement in our documents that needs to be revisited. That is the statement that a 10-lane freeway will replace a four-lane road. Anyone who reads this at a federal level will think that Pecos Road is already a major roadway. I think a descriptor needs to be added to make this clear.

SMCAT Member: I have an issue on page seven of the Parking Lot Issue memorandum. I asked a question about Desert Vista High School not being identified as a Section 4(f) property. My recollection was that ADOT was going to go back and update this. I am confused by the statement that was given. It seems that this statement is sticking to the information in last month’s presentation rather than what we were told during that meeting.

Ben Spargo: At the last meeting, we were presented with information from the Kyrene School District regarding this issue. The investigation is still ongoing because it requires some field investigations. We will update this information as appropriate. However, the presentation material still holds true that a school is a Section 4(f) property depending on the availability of athletic facilities to anyone who walks on campus after hours.

SMCAT Member: Can we leave this question in the Parking Lot Issues memorandum until the issue is resolved?

Amy Edwards: We have a letter from the Kyrene School District that will assist with the investigations regarding this issue.

Tom Keller: So we can possibly update the response to this question with information from the letter.

Let's move on. Before we start the social conditions presentation, I would like to remind the SMCAT members that I will be handing out the session feedback forms at the break. Please complete both sides of this form and return by the end of the meeting.

Ben Spargo: Before we begin the presentation, there is one other item. In the Parking Lot Issues memorandum, there was a question about where a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan can be viewed. We have a sample report from the U.S. 93 project, which is located at the back of the room.

With that, we will now begin the social conditions presentation. Mark Hollowell from ADOT's Environmental Planning Group will present the general overview and Pat Higgins from HDR will present the specifics as they relate to this study.

Mark Hollowell: Thank you Ben. Good evening everyone. Once again, I am Mark Hollowell, an environmental planner with ADOT. There are several related topics in this proposed National Environmental Policy Act study that are analyzed to determine the impacts to the human and natural environment. One of these topics is social conditions. Tonight, Pat Higgins and I will share with you an overview of this topic.

Social conditions encompass a broad range of human activities and social interactions. Some of the important definitions related to this topic are demographic characteristics and community character. Demographic characteristics are key elements that give us information about race, income, employment and population growth in the Study Area. You recognize a community's character as you drive through it. Though it has experienced incredible development these past few years, Laveen still retains a distinct rural feel. Ahwatukee, on the other hand, displays a distinct, more urban community characteristic as you drive through it. These community characteristics are clearly evident.

What are social conditions? Social conditions are the results of human interaction with one another, over time, and the patterns and characteristics they create. They include the recognition of demographic characteristics, community character and public facilities used for social gatherings, such as schools or churches.

So, why do we study social conditions? We have seen the Valley grow tremendously over the years. This growth has contributed to the creation of various communities and

their neighborhoods. Issues such as mobility, continuity and maintenance of a sense of place become important aspects to residents in those communities. It appears that land use and development patterns tend to attract persons with similar wants and needs. These patterns are an expression of what is important to the residents—a sense of place. We will see that distinct communities share common traits in the Study Area.

In analyzing the various alignment alternatives during the planning phase, environmental planners identify such communities to develop ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts that might occur during both the freeway construction and operation. In the Study Area, we identified five unique and identifiably distinct communities. Pat Higgins of HDR will now discuss those communities, their characteristics and how the proposed freeway might impact them.

Pat Higgins: I see there is already a question.

SMCAT Member: I am sorry to steal your thunder here. We are here to discuss the Eastern Section. Looking through the hardcopy of the presentation, I see there is quite a bit of information related to the Western Section. I would like to make a request that this presentation focus only on the Eastern Section.

Pat Higgins: Well, when we analyze the freeway corridor, we look at the freeway as a whole. We wouldn't want to neglect any information.

SMCAT Member: The Western Section social conditions topic has already been presented to the SMCAT. When it was presented, the representatives from the Eastern Section sat here quietly. I understand what you are saying, but we have already received the Western Section information on this proposed corridor.

Amy Edwards: Perhaps we could just quickly present information about the Western Section.

Tom Keller: Are there any other comments about this? Does anyone have a problem with just focusing on the Eastern Section?

SMCAT Member: I am sorry. I wasn't a member of the SMCAT a year ago. Was the reason the information about the Eastern Section wasn't presented was because the material wasn't prepared at that time?

Ben Spargo: No. In 2005, the SMCAT was meeting specifically to make a recommendation on the Western Section alternatives and that was the focus at that time. I think Pat can tailor this presentation to focus on the Eastern Section.

SMCAT Member: I would appreciate that. I think all the homeowner association representatives in the Eastern Section would like to hear about how this 10-lane freeway will rip through their communities.

SMCAT Member: I think this points to what a huge mistake this was to divide this proposed freeway between the Eastern and Western sections. You can feel the tension here. Dividing this freeway may be a good way to get it constructed, but it is not a good way to build a community's trust.

SMCAT Member: Most of these slides tend to have more information regarding the Western Section. This has happened during all these meetings. I guess the overall view has been presented because some people think it is fair. But the presentations have been heavily weighted for the Western Section. We aren't seeing the detail in the Eastern Section like we did for the Western Section.

Tom Keller: How shall we proceed?

SMCAT Member: Just have him talk fast.

SMCAT Member: Don't present the Western Section information.

Tom Keller: Pat, can you work with this sentiment?

Pat Higgins: Yes. On the screen, you see that we looked at five distinct communities. There are four in the Western Section and one in the Eastern section. The City of Tolleson and Santa Maria communities would not be directly affected. The remaining communities would be affected: Laveen, Dusty Lane and Ahwatukee.

SMCAT Member: What about the Estrella Village?

SMCAT Member: It isn't listed here as a distinct community.

Pat Higgins: The City of Tolleson is six square miles in size. Laveen has the largest area in which we are dealing. Over the years, industrial development has provided local employment to this community. In this area, the City of Phoenix has zoned the land to accommodate future freeway activities. Santa Maria is an 80-acre townsite development first developed in the early 1900s. The Dusty Lane community is an area of residences on the south side of the South Mountains, accessible from Dusty Lane and 51st Avenue. Ahwatukee is landlocked by Interstate 10 to the east, the South Mountains to the north and west and the Gila River Indian Community to the south. It is composed of contemporary master-planned communities with desert landscaping, golf courses and lakes. The character is modern and unified.

This map shows the public facilities and services located near proposed freeway alignments.

What are the potential construction-related impacts? An issue in Ahwatukee would be the visual and noise impacts, and you have already heard the presentations on those issues.

Existing neighborhoods could be temporarily divided and internal street systems disrupted, while access to public facilities could be temporarily altered. Temporary detours may affect police, fire and emergency travel routes and response times.

This slide shows the potential displacements for the Action Alternative. Here they are segregated by the Eastern and Western sections. In the Eastern Section, there are more single-family folks being affected.

ADOT would go through the process and purchase the necessary right-of-way, if needed. Nan Wilcox with ADOT's Right-of-Way Group is here, if there are any questions regarding property acquisitions.

SMCAT Member: How does the required residential properties right-of-way break down between Ahwatukee and Dusty Lane?

Ben Spargo: There are approximately 20 residential properties in the Dusty Lane community that would be affected. The impacts on the Dusty Lane community are included in the E1 Alternative information.

SMCAT Member: Going back to slide 28, the graph shows that the E1 Alternative would have an affect on one community facility. Is this a school?

Pat Higgins: No. The community facility affected is a church.

SMCAT Member: So the United Methodist Church that is further west wouldn't be affected? It appears to have a portion of its property in the right-of-way.

Ben Spargo: The only church I am aware that would be affected is the church at 24th Street and Pecos Road.

SMCAT Member: I think that we should have updated information regarding facilities for the Western Section. The map on slide 25 is not showing everything. There has been a great amount of development that has occurred over the past few years, including homes and businesses.

Ben Spargo: So you are saying this is located within the W55 alignment? The table is only quantifying what would be directly impacted.

SMCAT Member: How long ago were the numbers presented on slide 28 updated?

Ben Spargo: We looked at an aerial in preparing this.

SMCAT Member: How long ago?

SMCAT Member: On the slide, it lists the last date of the aerial photography being April 2006.

Ben Spargo: Yes, that was the original date that the properties were quantified. We continue to update this information as we get newer aerals.

SMCAT Member: There is a video flyover available on the study Web site. On this video, the corridor boundaries are hard to determine. It appears that the park-and-ride lot is in the right-of-way. I also think Los Lagos School is within the boundary.

Ben Spargo: I don't think the video flyover is 100 percent accurate as far as the boundaries shown. The right-of-way footprint that was presented in the November 2005 public meetings hasn't changed.

SMCAT Member: What about the brand new storage facility near Pecos Road?

Ben Spargo: I believe it is located on Gila River Indian Community land, so it wouldn't be affected.

SMCAT Member: It is located 10 feet from Pecos Road. It wouldn't be affected?

Ben Spargo: No. And there wouldn't be a freeway interchange at 32nd Street so their access would remain.

SMCAT Member: I noticed that the numbers on slide 28 for the W55 businesses has gone up. Is this due to the shift in alignment due to the tank farm?

Ben Spargo: Yes. By shifting the alignment we are impacting more businesses.

SMCAT Member: I remember the numbers when Amy Edwards first presented the tank farm shift in alignment. I am amazed it has gone up even more.

Ben Spargo: As we do the field research, we continue to find more information regarding this.

SMCAT Member: The loss of these businesses will impact the workers in the West Valley. Some of these people don't have high paying jobs and they take busses to work. This will be a big impact.

Ben Spargo: I have been in some of the meeting with the businesses who could potentially be acquired. In some cases, they should be able to relocate to nearby land.

SMCAT Member: That's what I am pushing for. I'm sorry. I know we are supposed to be discussing the Eastern Section.

Amy Edwards: That brings up a good point. I know it was discussed that the Western Section information was already presented to the SMCAT over two years ago. What you have just seen is that this information has already changed somewhat.

SMCAT Member: Since you are including the Dusty Lane community as a part of the E1 Alternative, I wonder if you have told us that you are waiting to do the design on this section because you are unsure about how this freeway will affect their utility access. Are you considering purchasing everyone's property in this community?

Ben Spargo: The plan is to provide access by keeping the road Dusty Lane as it is now and constructing an overpass at Ivanhoe Street.

SMCAT Member: Does this mean there will be a giant wall?

Ben Spargo: No, not necessary. There may be a wall at the freeway, an embankment and then an ADOT fence. At Ivanhoe Street, there would be an underpass.

Pat Higgins: Are there any other right-of-way questions?

Tom Keller: Are there any right-of-way questions for Nan Wilcox?

No response

Pat Higgins: Okay. We have already talked about some of the construction impacts. After construction, increased road capacity from the proposed freeway could improve overall traffic circulation and accessibility in the region.

SMCAT Member: I am sorry to interrupt. On slide 31, the second bullet states information about the Western Section. Where is the bullet for the Eastern Section? What about the affects on Pecos Road?

Pat Higgins: This slides emphasis is actually on the first bullet point since most of the land in the Eastern Section is already established.

SMCAT Member: I understand that. I am asking you to add a bullet to address the Eastern Section for continuity.

SMCAT Member: Does this information include drainage? Where is the runoff water going to go? Are these locations going to be included with the impacts after construction?

Ben Spargo: The drainage facilities will be contained within the right-of-way footprint.

SMCAT Member: When ADOT clears a swath from the residential homes they are purchasing, there will be a significant amount of water runoff. Where would it all go? Where would the water retention facility be located?

Ben Spargo: In the Eastern Section, there are no plans for large retention basins. ADOT would try to keep the existing conditions in place as they are now with the water passing south through a number of culverts. ADOT may construct some small retention basins, but they would be located with the freeway right-of-way.

Tom Keller: We have this documentation in the drainage presentation from a few months ago.

SMCAT Member: What about the potential impact on a community? With the loss of 100 houses, is that included when evaluating the impacts?

Ben Spargo: Do you mean the community's loss of the homeowners association's fees from these properties?

SMCAT Member: Yes.

Ben Spargo: This would be negotiated during the acquisition process. The ADOT Right-of-Way Group is currently developing a policy for this.

Pat Higgins: If the freeway were not constructed, there would be no direct impacts on community character. Major portions of the Study Area would continue changing in character due to population growth and land development, depending on the economy.

Certain impacts could be reduced or eliminated. The timing of construction impacts could be considered to minimize social impacts. The proposed alignment would be evaluated so that it doesn't bisect established communities. ADOT would coordinate with local jurisdictions to address and correct impacts on internal road networks. Noise barriers and landscaping would be used to reduce noise and visual intrusions.

SMCAT Member: The statement on slide 32, "Increasing congestion on local street network would be expected..." seems incorrect. Ahwatukee is fairly built out and people would not be traveling through it. Is this really an accurate statement?

Pat Higgins: Traffic congestion may not increase in Ahwatukee as much as in the Western Section.

SMCAT Member: You need to add a bullet to that slide explaining that.

SMCAT Member: How is this proposed freeway not going to also increase traffic congestion in Ahwatukee on local streets?

Pat Higgins: The freeway will assist in providing a regional traffic flow for the area.

SMCAT Member: But you said that this proposed freeway will drive development. I agree.

SMCAT Member: Is there anything quantified about how much residential and commercial development would accompany the construction of this freeway?

Ben Spargo: The City of Phoenix General Plan has designated which land near this proposed freeway would be zoned residential versus commercial.

SMCAT Member: Is it outside of the scope of this study to identify the traffic volumes on the local streets?

Ben Spargo: We have already presented much of this traffic information in past SMCAT meetings.

SMCAT Member: The City of Phoenix did a traffic study, but they could not model what would happen to traffic during construction of a freeway on Pecos Road. It seems the traffic will all go to Chandler Boulevard.

Ben Spargo: You are talking about during construction of the proposed freeway?

SMCAT Member: Yes.

Ben Spargo: The project team is developing an implementation plan that will most likely allow traffic to continue on Pecos Road or a similar facility through the construction process. The construction would be done on the north half, or westbound lanes, of the freeway first, keeping Pecos Road intact. When the north half was complete, traffic would be shifted from Pecos Road to those lanes. How access is provided to the area west of 17th Avenue would be an issue. It may be something where Chandler Boulevard might need to be extended.

SMCAT Member: On slide 27, the bullets seemed to run out and then the subject was changed on the following slide. There isn't a bullet that says how ADOT will address the major impact of the Ahwatukee traffic being rerouted. This would account for the thousands of people that live in this cul-de-sac community. The construction impact would be huge. You explained on a slide about the wonderful Ahwatukee community character. You give it lip service but didn't seem to fully evaluate the impacts.

Ben Spargo: As presented previously, a number of alignments were evaluated in the Eastern Section. This was the same with the Western Section. We used the social conditions analysis when we made decisions regarding which alignment would have the least amount of impacts. In the Eastern Section, that was the alignment along Pecos Road. In the Western Section, we shifted the alignment around the Santa Maria community, and a major factor in the overall decision was the fact that the W101 Alternative would have bisected Tolleson and greatly impacted their community.

SMCAT Member: We have 27 square miles. I don't think it was fair.

SMCAT Member: I thought the topic was social conditions. Not mobility or traffic congestion issues, correct?

Pat Higgins: Yes.

SMCAT Member: I would like a clarification about a statement made in the social conditions technical report summary on page 5. The text reads, "The E1 Alternative would not substantially alter the character of Ahwatukee Foothills Village." There are many editorials that contradict that statement. It continues, "As mentioned, Ahwatukee is nearly fully developed." This goes back to the discussion we had earlier about mobility and the additional traffic that you say would be added to the local streets. And further, "While the proposed South Mountain Freeway would introduce additional noise impacts along the southern edges of the village, this type of impact would not be new, considering I-10 borders the village to the east." I don't understand this argument. Because you think the noise already exists in this area, adding more noise wouldn't cause a substantial impact?

Needless to say, this report on social conditions did a rather poor job of reporting the overall general impact to Ahwatukee. It does not mention anything about loss of property values, added traffic congestion to our area and additional crime that would be introduced to this area. All you have to do is look at the local crime log to see that the closer you get to Interstate 10, the more crime is happening. You haven't even addressed the crime issue and how it relates to freeways in the Western Section communities.

Tom Keller: Is your question that the actual area social conditions don't match the technical report summary?

SMCAT Member: The social conditions being reported don't address the current conditions in Ahwatukee.

SMCAT Member: I brought up a social condition in a SMCAT meeting a few years ago. I was thinking about it this morning. The Ahwatukee area has a serious recreational component for bicyclists. I was riding this morning at about 5:15 a.m. when I saw some triathletes training. This is an area amenity and should be included in the social conditions report. As you enter the Ahwatukee area and see the welcome sign, there is even a bicyclist on it. That is why we are questioning the broad statement that was given in the technical report summary that the E1 Alternative would not substantially alter the character of the Ahwatukee Foothills Village.

Tom Keller: It is now 7:25 p.m. Let's take a break and reconvene at 7:35 p.m.

Break taken at 7:25 p.m.

Tom Keller: Okay. Let's get started.

As we get back to our seats, I have a couple things to mention. The cumulative and secondary impacts section will be rolled into the October meeting. Also, I had someone ask about when additional input can be given to us about who you would like to see as part of the air quality panel in a future, currently unscheduled meeting. At this time, anyone who has additional input on this subject can share his or her information.

SMCAT Member: When I was at the Ahwatukee Village Planning meeting, I made a request to see if anyone in the community knew someone who could be a part of the air quality panel. I was given the name of Rick Haddow. He has worked in the past as an environmental coordinator in ADOT's Globe District and has experience with air quality issues. I can send his contact information to you.

Tom Keller: Please send the contact information to Fred.

SMCAT Member: I think there should be a representative from Maricopa County Air Quality and Nancy Wrona from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. I think Maricopa County Air Quality has a new director, but they haven't announced who it is.

SMCAT Member: Yes. They have, but I don't know his name.

SMCAT Member: Well, the name of the new director is not on their Web site. Also, there should be a representative from the Maricopa Association of Governments. I think the air quality expert with MAG is Lindy Bauer.

Tom Keller: Thank you. I want to remind you that members of the public can submit blue question cards near the end of this meeting and SMCAT members now have the feedback session forms. Please make sure that you turn these completed forms in at the end of this meeting. The meeting feedback is always quite helpful for us.

Let's now continue with the estimated costs presentation.

Mike Bruder: For those of you who do not know me, my name is Mike Bruder. I am with ADOT's Valley Project Management Group and am the manager of this study.

Basically, there are two entities that ADOT uses to estimate these potential project costs: the Arizona Transportation Research Center and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Arizona Transportation Research Center administers ADOT's research activity and the publication of results. The Bureau of Labor statistics is a unit of the U.S. Department of Labor that collects, processes, analyzes and distributes a broad range of data associated with labor economics and statistics.

So where have we been? Slide 39 shows the project cost information that was presented to the SMCAT on April 6, 2006. As you know, the estimated total project cost at that time was \$1.7 billion.

Looking at the price trends for freeway elements, some of the materials being evaluated include diesel, gasoline, asphalt, lumber, plastic and labor. These items are evaluated for the short-term, or one year, and long-term, or 5 to 10 year, changes in price.

Slide 41 shows the short-term track of what has been going on. From July 2006 to July 2007, you can see the moderate price increase of about 4 percent, which is about the rate of inflation. When you look at July 2007 through July 2008, you can see that there was a huge jump of about 19 percent. This included the price of diesel fuel rising by 85 percent and asphalt rising by 53 percent.

Looking at the long-term trends, you can see that over the past five years prices have gone up by about 71 percent. Over the past 10 years, prices have gone up by about 89 percent. As you can tell, this is a huge increase. The biggest increases were in the prices for diesel, gasoline and asphalt. ADOT checks with the Association of General Contractors, who compares prices from the national with the local levels. In Arizona, when the prices spiked over 71 percent in the past five years, the national jump for these materials over the same time period was 77 percent.

In addition to national material price trends, ADOT monitors local material costs by reviewing construction project bid tabulations. Every time ADOT receives bids from contractors, they are evaluated to make sure the estimates are in line with other recent construction bids.

These graphs show the changes in prices since 2003 in roadway excavation, noise walls, concrete surfacing and reinforcing steel. ADOT has seen that costs for these items and almost all other materials costs have this upward trend in price. It seems that now the curve has reached a stabilizing point and has actually started to decline since the economy has softened. The price of fuel is still volatile since this can fluctuate on such factors as hurricanes and projected shortages. For all of these items, there is an escalation clause in our contract, which is the mechanism to recoup some of these items that have increasing prices. With that, Ben will continue the presentation.

Ben Spargo: Thanks Mike. The construction and right-of-way cost estimates include costs for some of the design refinements that have been made. We evaluated the latest unit prices that Mike discussed. All the costs that we will be showing are in existing dollars and are not projected costs for a future construction date.

In reviewing each element, I want to try to relate this information to some of the previous topics that have been discussed by the SMCAT. The bridge costs include the bridge that would span the Salt River. The length of the bridge would be determined by the

regulations discussed in the water resources presentation. As discussed in the cultural resources presentation, the freeway would span the historic railroad and RID canal. The biology presentation included a discussion about potential wildlife crossings. The bridges associated with all of these are included in this category. The drainage costs include the items that were discussed in the roadway profile presentation including basins, culverts, and a channel. Earthwork costs, including the excavation of the South Mountains, were discussed in the geotechnical presentation. The pavement cost includes the cost of paving the roadway surface with rubberized asphalt, which although it cannot be officially used for noise mitigation, has been found to be a very good deterrent for noise. Traffic costs include safety features common to freeways around the region including guide signs, striping, lighting and freeway management systems. The utility costs include potential relocations of utilities discussed during that presentation, including city facilities and power lines. Wall costs include predominantly the sound walls that were presented during the noise presentation. Roadway appurtenances are safety features, such as barriers, guardrails and fencing. The “other costs” represent a large portion of the overall construction cost and include items such as landscaping, contingencies and contractor-related costs such as mobilization, quality control, construction engineering, and surveying.

The table on slide 49 presents an estimate of the construction costs broken down for the entire corridor, including the W55 and E1 alternatives, by element. The construction costs have increased 25 percent from the 2006 estimate. This is fairly in line with the national trends for unit prices.

The right-of-way costs include acquisition, relocation and demolition costs for each property. Descriptions and a list of assumptions are included in the cost estimate technical report summary so I will not get into them in detail. The original field studies were done in December 2005 and original cost estimates were developed in January 2006.

Based on experience with other ADOT projects in the region, the right-of-way estimate has been increased to account for anticipated costs associated with the acquisition and condemnation process. This includes: legal fees, appraisals, court settlements and survey costs. So we have added some so that the costs are reflected more accurately to the conditions of the marketplace.

Slide 52 shows the overall right-of-way costs based on each element. These costs are 50 percent higher than the 2006 estimate.

SMCAT Member: You don’t have it broken down. What do you mean 50 percent higher?

Ben Spargo: The total right-of-way costs are 50 percent higher than the 2006 estimate.

Mike Bruder: The cost was about \$600 million in the 2006 estimate.

SMCAT Member: In 2006, some property in Laveen was going for \$200,000 an acre. Now the same property is \$80,000 an acre. I wonder why the costs would go up instead of down.

Mike Bruder: The prices don't seem to have dropped for commercial land.

SMCAT Member: You need a new real estate appraiser.

Mike Bruder: These are not appraisals; they are value-level estimates.

SMCAT Member: It seems that in the 2006 estimate, the other costs you have added as a part of this estimate were not included. So really, the 50 percent increase is related to the additional costs.

Ben Spargo: This last slide summarizes the construction, design and right-of-way costs to represent the overall cost for this proposed freeway. The total of \$2.4 billion is 40 percent higher than the 2006 estimate.

SMCAT Member: I have a clarification. For the estimated right-of-way total of \$930 million, utilities are included, correct?

Amy Edwards: No, utilities are included as part of the construction cost.

SMCAT Member: Yes, but the slide titled, "What is included in the right-of-way cost estimate" states "includes acquisition, relocation and demolition costs for each property."

Ben Spargo: The bullet point there is stating that the relocation costs associated with a particular parcel where ADOT would need the right-of-way. Utility relocation costs are included in the construction cost estimate.

Nan Wilcox: If a utility facility would need to be purchased by ADOT, this would be included in the right-of-way cost estimate.

SMCAT Member: I would like some clarification on the date when you developed the study's purpose and need for a 10-lane facility. Was this done in 2003? Anyway, I would like to ask why this estimate of \$2.4 billion is only for a 6-lane roadway?

Mike Bruder: Well, that is what is currently funded.

SMCAT Member: Doesn't the study purpose and need say a 10-lane freeway is required?

Ben Spargo: No. A 6-lane roadway is what is funded. The 10-lane roadway would be the ultimate build out.

SMCAT Member: Can you provide us with the current costs to construct this freeway with 10 lanes, rather than 6?

Ben Spargo: We could provide you with this, if needed.

SMCAT Member: When can we see this? Is this something we can see right now or is this something that needs to go into the Parking Lot Issues memorandum?

Ben Spargo: It would need to go into the Parking Lot issues Memorandum.

SMCAT Member: I don't understand why these costs were only presented to us for the 6-lane roadway.

Ben Spargo: The additional cost for the four lanes would only be related to the cost of paving for the 22-mile length of the freeway.

Tom Keller: The answer to your question is that ADOT will be providing the answer to your question in the Parking Lot Issues Memorandum.

SMCAT Member: We started the SMCAT meeting process a few years before I became involved. Obviously there was a high spike in the prices of everything. I can only imagine what the cost to build this freeway will be by the time it is built, maybe in 2020. By the time it is built, the numbers that ADOT is estimating will be invalid. So by asking what the cost will be for the full 10-lane roadway seems unnecessary.

Mike Bruder: You are correct. All the costs shown in this cost estimate are in today's dollars. There is a contingency for the revenue stream, but there is no way to anticipate inflation. Every time ADOT receives new bids, the new numbers are rolled into what you see here today.

SMCAT Member: I guess as residents, we need to ask Congress for earmarks.

Tom Keller: Are there any other questions?

SMCAT Member: I have a technical question regarding the price of the Interstate 10/South Mountain Freeway interchange. Will it still be 28 lanes and is this included in this cost estimate?

Ben Spargo: Where the South Mountain Freeway would connect with Interstate 10, there would be six lanes each way plus the auxiliary lanes. I think it would equal a total of 16 roadway lanes, not 28.

SMCAT Member: Was there ever a project cost estimate done when the Regional Transportation Plan was approved?

Ben Spargo: At the time of the Regional Transportation Plan, it was estimated that the proposed South Mountain Freeway would cost \$1.1 billion. As we reported earlier, the construction costs over the past five years have increased by 71 percent. Any project around the region is most likely having these same funding issues.

SMCAT Member: If we would have built it years ago, there wouldn't have been the development that is in the area now.

SMCAT Member: I would like to have clarification about a response in the Parking Lot Issues memorandum. The question asked how much money has already been spent on this study. The answer was \$106.7 million. How can so much money already have been spent?

Mike Bruder: That cost includes a portion of the construction of the system interchange connecting Pecos Road to Loop 202 (Santan Freeway) and Interstate 10. That accounts for \$43 million so far.

Ben Spargo: There is an attachment in the back of the cost estimate technical report summary that has a table associated with the construction costs that Mike is mentioning.

SMCAT Member: I don't see it.

Ben Spargo: There should be two attachments.

SMCAT Member: I don't have it.

Ben Spargo: The information in the attachments provides more detail. We will include them as an attachment in the next Parking Lot Issues memorandum.

Tom Keller: Is there anything else?

In your packet, you have the presentation slides for the cumulative and secondary impacts section. Are there any specific issues in which you think we should be focused?

SMCAT Member: Are you looking at these impacts only for the Eastern Section?

Ben Spargo: I don't think that cumulative and secondary impacts information is presented as an Eastern versus Western basis. We could try to incorporate more examples from the Eastern Section.

SMCAT Member: Yes, that would be a good idea.

Tom Keller: Are there any other items in regards to the cumulative and secondary impacts topic so we can get a heads up?

No response

Fred Erickson: If you have time to read through the cumulative and secondary impacts presentation and have suggestions, please e-mail either Tom or me and we will forward the request to the presenters.

Tom Keller: I have two blue question cards that have been turned in. Are there any more?

No response

Public Written Question: At the July SMCAT meeting, I requested the raw cut-line traffic data developed by the Maricopa Association of Governments for the regional mobility study. How can I follow up on this request?

Ben Spargo: I have contacted the Maricopa Association of Governments to follow up on this request. I am working with them because I don't believe actually reviewing the MAG model is possible. I am trying to find out what they could provide to the public.

Tom Keller: When you requested this, did you give us your contact information?

Public Comment: I don't know.

Tom Keller: Please write your contact information down on your blue question card so we can get back to you.

Public Written Question: Does ADOT have the money to build this freeway? What would be the source of the money?

Mike Bruder: We currently have about \$200 million in Phase 1 and \$900 million in Phase 2 of the RTP for this proposed freeway..

Public Written Question: If construction were to begin, when would it start and when would it end?

Mike Bruder: After we receive a Record of Decision, assuming the decision is to build this freeway, ADOT would require 24 months for design. This 6-lane roadway would be constructed in about four years.

Public Written Question: Is it true that those tall power lines poles along the south side of Pecos Road would be moved to the north side?

Mike Bruder: No. At this time, it is too cost prohibitive to move them. It would cost about \$1 million per pole to move.

Public Question: Someone else started to touch on subject that got me thinking. Will ADOT continue to want to build this freeway if the costs keep increasing as they have been over the past five years? What about the economy being down?

Mike Bruder: The economy is cyclical. Three years from now, the situation may be different.

Ben Spargo: At the regional level, ADOT is having discussions with MAG to see if their long-range plans are still accurate. It's difficult to make short-term changes to a long-term plan. I am not sure if these discussions are only focused on interstate freeways.

Mike Bruder: No, they are also concerning regional freeways.

Public Question: So will the South Mountain Freeway be a 6- or a 10-lane roadway?

Ben Spargo: ADOT would be purchasing the right-of-way needed to construct a 10-lane freeway. The construction of the freeway would be 6 lanes; the remaining 4 lanes would be constructed at a later point.

SMCAT Member: So how much money is available to construct this freeway?

Mike Bruder: We have about half the necessary money needed.

SMCAT Member: So how will it get built if ADOT doesn't have the money?

Mike Bruder: I was waiting for someone to ask that question. Typically, there are various strategies used when revenues are not matching the construction cost. We could reduce the project scope, scale back on the facility we are building or phase project construction.

As project manager, the first thing I do is ask for additional money. Sometimes new funding sources are created. I know that the TIME initiative was unable to be approved, but there may be other sources for revenue. It may come down to removing this project from our list or not building it at all.

Tom Keller: It is 8:30 p.m. The next SMCAT meeting is scheduled for October 23.

SMCAT Member: I make a motion that we adjourn.

Tom Keller: Is there a second?

SMCAT Member: I second the motion.

Tom Keller: All in favor?

Majority of hands were raised

Tom Keller: The next SMCAT meeting is scheduled for October 23. Thank you for your attendance.

The meeting is adjourned.

Meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

Two blue comment/question cards submitted by the public were not read during the meeting. The information contained on the cards is as follows:

- Please include the social aspect of bicycles on Pecos Road in the social conditions.
- Please include on page 5 of the social conditions a more complete description of altered character of Ahwatukee Foothills (i.e., impact to visual and social community conditions).